



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and we have not been able to satisfy ourselves of the desirability, on the whole, of any corrections whatever. What we are quite clear about is the great value of his work, even to those who are familiar with the original, and we should not except the German Hegelians from the number.

His *Prolegomena*, Mr. Wallace says, "have not been given in the hope or with the intention of expounding the Hegelian system. They merely seek to remove certain obstacles, and to render Hegel less tantalizingly hard to those who approach him for the first time." Mr. Wallace probably wishes neither to dogmatize nor to be dogmatized over, but chooses to keep his hands free to clear the ground from misconceptions as to Hegel's philosophy, in any way that seemed best, and to bring it nearer to ordinary modes of thought and to the problems of the day; in short here, as in his translation, to introduce Hegel's ideas rather than his formulas. The short *Vocabulary* appended to the *Prolegomena* is a masterly discussion of the most important terms which recur in Hegel's writings, and the translation, from the necessity of the case, is a perpetual commentary as well.

6. — *A Concordance to Shakespeare's Poems: an Index to every Word therein contained.* By MRS. HORACE HOWARD FURNESS. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. iv, 422.

THE publication, in 1846, of Mrs. Cowden Clarke's "Concordance to Shakespeare's Plays" marked an era in the history of that voluminous and constantly increasing literature which his works have called into being. Then, as never before, did it become possible to make Shakespeare his own interpreter; for then, as never before, it became possible to make a minute and critical comparison of the phrases, words, and meanings of words to be met with in his writings. A marvellous book is Mrs. Clarke's Concordance. Its freedom from misprints in the text, and the exact accuracy of its multitudinous references, are wellnigh unexampled. But, great as its merits undeniably are, its title — "The Complete Concordance to Shakespeare" — is a gross misnomer; for it is evident that no concordance to Shakespeare can fairly lay claim to be considered "complete" which not only fails to take note of upwards of one hundred and seventy words occurring in his Plays, but which entirely omits his Poems. But now comes Mrs. Furness to make good — as far as she may — the regrettable deficiency in this *vade-mecum* of every Shakespearian student. She comes, too, with a volume by its "outwards so com-

mended," a volume so convenient in size and form, so excellent in paper, type, and press-work, that it may satisfy the demands of the most exacting connoisseur.

Shakespeare himself tells us that "through crystal walls the smallest motes are seen." If we proceed to offer some detailed criticism on the work before us, we wish it distinctly understood in advance, that, after all, we have discovered nothing but "motes." The essential accuracy and practical usefulness of the Concordance are not impeached, and are indeed quite unimpeachable.

Perhaps the first thing that will strike the eye of any one who opens the volume will be the unstopped abbreviations of the titles of the various poems to which numerical reference is made; as, "V A," "R L," "Son," etc. Now, usage and logic are the parents and upholders of punctuation. But the omission of the usual sign of abbreviation can be justified neither by the one nor the other. So far from thinking the omission to be in the best taste, we cannot but regard it as a positive eyesore. The case is a very different one from that of an inscription, where the endings of the lines and the local disposition of the parts serve to bring out the sense clearly enough, without resorting to the aid of points. In the present work, however, the title-page is, with curious inconsistency, partly punctuated, and partly not. It is worth noting, perhaps, that the abbreviation "Co.," in the imprint, has a period after it, while "Mrs.," four lines above, is printed, *Scotticè*, without one.

A similar blemish is found in the adoption of the old-fashioned plan of indicating, by means of an apostrophe, the silent *e* in the preterite tense and the past participle of certain regular verbs, such as *seem'd*, *look'd*, and the like. In former times, when the inflectional termination *ed* was customarily pronounced as a separate syllable, there was an obvious fitness in representing the suppression of the vowel by the use of this mark; but at the present day, when the general practice is a diametrically opposite one, the propriety of supplying the place of the vowel with an apostrophe is exceedingly questionable. We are aware that the Concordance follows "the text of the Cambridge edition, with the exception of some trifling deviations in punctuation," and we are also aware of the fact that that edition retains the *e* "when it is an essential part of the verb" (as in *love*), and substitutes an apostrophe "where the 'e' is a part of the inflection" (as in *touch'd*); but so far from thinking this to be a desirable "*via media*, which avoids metrical uncertainties on the one hand, and verbal ambiguities on the other," we regard it as little better than a mere vagary, or an example of orthographical trifling, which

we should certainly make all haste to "deviate" from. For, plausible as, at first blush, the rule may seem, we not only deny that it has any practical usefulness, but we consider it to be positively misleading, inasmuch as it makes no discrimination between the cases in which the *e* is silent, and those in which it is sounded. Thus, we continually meet with absurdities like the following (in the last two lines of Sonnet 4) : —

" Thy unused beauty must be tomb'd with thee,
Which, used, lives th' executor to be."

What really good and sufficient reason can be given why "unused" and "tomb'd" — in both of which the *e* is mute — should be so differently represented to the eye? And why should "used" — in which the *e* is pronounced — be printed as if it were silent? We opine that the questions are more easily asked than answered.

As the Poems themselves are wisely appended to the Concordance, it will make no difference whatever to the consulter of the latter, that the references to "Venus and Adonis," "The Rape of Lucrece," "A Lover's Complaint," and "The Phoenix and Turtle" are single, or to the lines merely, while in the "Sonnets" and "The Passionate Pilgrim" they are double, being first to the individual sonnet or poem, and then to the particular line. It might be difficult, however, to assign a satisfactory reason for adopting two different methods of reference, when one and the same method would have been both more natural and perfectly practicable. We should have been glad if the stanzas in each of the four first-mentioned poems had been consecutively numbered, — a thing which has never been done, we believe, in any edition of them. But here again the Concordance closely follows the Cambridge Shakespeare.

The rule having been adopted of restricting the citations to the clause in which a given word occurs, we are at a loss to understand why so many lines, on almost every page, are given at full length. There would seem to be little or no typographical necessity for not adhering to the rule in all strictness; though, as to the rule itself, while there is much to be said in its favor, and while it is probably, on the whole, the best that could have been framed, there is still room for raising more than one objection to it.

The imperfections we have thus far noticed lie on the surface, and, though in our judgment they are worthy of attention and correction, they are still of comparatively small importance. A graver defect is the entire exclusion from the book of the Dedication of "Venus and Adonis," and the Dedication and Argument prefixed to "The Rape of Lucrece."

These — the only prose compositions of the author, not dramatic, which have come down to us — are as much part and parcel of the poems before which they stand, as a porch is a part of the house to which it gives admission. And not only so, but they are important for the contributions they afford to the language of Shakespeare. They do not, indeed, contain any words — except proper names — which are not elsewhere to be met with in the compass of his works ; but a complete verbal census of that rich domain should certainly take account of such as are to be found in this portion of it. If one should rely on Mrs. Clarke's and Mrs. Furness's Concordances alone, he would conclude that the word "pamphlet" is used by Shakespeare only once (in 1 Henry VI. iii. 1), whereas it also occurs in his Dedication of the "Lucrece." Mrs. Clarke records the words "acclamation" and "invective" as each being used in a single instance in the Plays. Mrs. Furness admits neither of them into her vocabulary, though both are to be found in the Argument to the poem just referred to. Other illustrations hardly less striking might be given, but these may suffice.

In most of her deviations from the plan of Mrs. Clarke's Concordance, we think Mrs. Furness has shown a more sagacious judgment than her predecessor ; but that she has done so in the matter of "various readings" we are by no means sure. While we admit that Mrs. Clarke's collation and citation of editions of the Plays were extremely meagre and unsatisfactory, — being confined to Collier and Knight alone, — and that they should either have been extended much further or retrenched altogether, we do not forget that the Poems are comparatively free from misprints, and therefore furnish so small a number of important lections that neither the task of the compiler nor the bulk of her work would have been materially increased by the insertion of all of them. That they would have given the book an additional and substantive value, we are confident. Take, for example, this clause, "the picture of pure piety," which is to be found in the editions of Knight, Collier, Halliwell, and White, — to name no others, — in "The Rape of Lucrece," stanza 78, line 3. In the Concordance the passage is not given under "pure." Looking under "picture" or "piety," we find the entry to be —

"the picture of *true* piety" R L 542,"

in accordance with the reading of the Cambridge Shakespeare, which here, however, — notwithstanding the boasted purity of its text, — refuses to recognize the decisive authority of the *editio princeps* of 1594. In our view it would have been a decided and obvious im-

provement if the citation had been printed thus, "the picture of pure [true] piety," and had been entered under "true" as well as under "pure."

The utility of any work of reference must depend mainly upon its accuracy. This is the prime requisite. Of course, a certain percentage of error must be allowed for, but it should be the object of the compiler, first, last, and always, to reduce the amount to a minimum. Errors are of two kinds, the avoidable and the unavoidable. In the former category we place all violations of alphabetical order in the arrangement of the initial or key words (or the headings of articles), on the correctness of which order, it is clear, ease if not success in consultation is wholly dependent. This matter should always be made a special and separate object of attention in reading the proof-sheets of catalogues, dictionaries, cyclopædias, directories, in short, of all abecedarian lists of whatever name or nature. It would seem not to have been done in the present instance, as we find "across" occurring between "accounted" and "accumulate," and "afloat," "afraid," and "afresh" between "afford" and "affright," — to cite no more examples. Within the same category fall also all violations of numerical order in the citations from any one of the poems, as in the third and fourth extracts from "The Rape of Lucrece," under the word "Book."

Warned by our own experience, we fully agree to the statement in the Preface, that "no human vigilance" can guard against misprints. The Concordance is, on the whole, we think, remarkably free from them, though we have detected a few; such as "*imperfect* actor," for "*unperfect* actor" (see ACTOR), "*this* advantage" for "*his* advantage" (see ADVANTAGE), "*throw* my affections" for "*threw* my affections" (see AFFECTION), "*makes* true men thieves" for "*make* true men thieves" (see TRUE). Doubtless there are others, which would be brought to light by a more extended scrutiny than we have been able to bestow. The pages being stereotyped, errors of this kind can be corrected at any time; and the compiler in her modest and graceful Preface proffers her thanks to the kindness that will notify her of them.

Our experience has also taught us that inconsistencies as well as misprints are among the things "against which it seems that no human vigilance can guard." Such are the following: "'T was," in "'T was not their infirmity," is entered both under "'T was" and "It," but not under "Was." On the other hand, "'t were," in "As 't were encouraging the Greeks to fight," is entered under "'T were" and "Were," but not under "It."

Are omissions — of which, without much searching, we have discovered a few — equally unavoidable? We are inclined to think not. What Mrs. Furness's *modus operandi* may have been in the construction and revision of her Concordance, we do not know; but we are convinced that the simple method adopted in the preparation of the "Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament" and the "Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament" will, if carefully carried out, insure absolute completeness in any work of this sort. The manuscript having been finished, each word cited in it, beginning with the first and proceeding regularly to the last, should be found in the original work, and therein underlined, or erased, with ink. When the whole has thus been verified, a careful examination of the author would show at once how many and what words had been omitted; for, if *every* word cited in the manuscript were marked in the original, the words not marked in it would, of course, not be in the manuscript. We infer — perhaps wrongly — that Mrs. Furness did not take this course; if not, it might be well for her to do so even now.

We have endeavored to estimate impartially the merits of this Concordance. We have taken exception to some things in its plan and execution, yet we can hardly "dispraise but in a kind of praise." And in one particular, which "the ignorance of foolish men" — or perhaps their want of reflection — will be likely to make a mock of, — namely, the insertion of particles, — we are disposed to commend unqualifiedly the course adopted. The reasons for this course are well stated in the Preface, and cannot, as it seems to us, be gainsaid. The popular idea of a concordance — that it is designed simply to facilitate the finding of some half-remembered passage, and that this is its only use — is altogether erroneous. It has functions of a higher order. In the microscopic anatomy to which modern lexicography and criticism subject the language of an author, this is the very instrument by means of which the variety of verbal forms and the various shades of meaning that are to be met with in his writings may be recognized and leisurely observed and studied. Their penetrating inspection is turned upon the humbler no less than the nobler parts of speech. And when directed to the language of Shakespeare, it reveals a richness and freedom and pregnant force in his use of words, to which our tamer if preciser English of the present day is a stranger. Nowhere, perhaps, is the flexibility of his diction to be more clearly seen than in his use of the particles. We cannot venture to multiply examples, but a single illustration may be given. Let us take the very first word in the Concordance, the indefinite article *a*,

the citations under which occupy nearly nine columns, an amount of space which probably ninety-nine persons out of a hundred would think absolutely wasted, but which contains lexical and grammatical material of no small value. Here is to be found more than one instance of that emphatic use of the word — unrecognized by the dictionaries, but not infrequent in writings of the Elizabethan time — which is traceable to its etymological identity with the numeral *one*. “’Tis but *a* kiss I beg” (that is, a single kiss, one kiss), says Venus to the coy Adonis. So also in Sonnet 75 we find the same intensive sense: “Clean starvèd for *a* look.” Compare Hamlet’s inquiry, in the fencing scene with Laertes, “These foils have all *a* length?” Compare also the Scottish *ae*, the modern representative of the older form *ane*; as in Burns’s familiar line, “*Ae* fond kiss, and then we sever.”

We cannot conclude without echoing the words of Thomas Thorpe, and wishing “the only begetter” of this excellent Concordance “all happiness and that eternity promised by our ever-living poet.” But she must not be content to rest here. She has something more than patient assiduity: she has talents and abundant leisure that should not remain unemployed. Having shown that she knows how to use them to the best advantage, let her remember that *noblesse oblige*. May we not hope, that, in furtherance of the large task her husband has set himself to perform, and is performing so admirably, but can hardly expect to complete, she will give us a new variorum edition of Shakespeare’s Poems?

7.—*A History of France down to the Year 1453.* By G. W. KITCHIN, M. A., formerly Censor of Christ Church, Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 1873.

THIS book is a considerable improvement on the ordinary school-history of English production. Mr. Kitchin is, it is true, a little infected with the pedantry which Mr. Freeman has made fashionable, and appears to imagine that he recommends a text-book by writing it, as he says, “from original sources,” instead of following the results gained by far deeper students than himself. But this is a mild species of affectation which has the excuse of thoroughly good intention, and is only mentioned here because it seems to have really injured the usefulness of the book, as will be seen hereafter; a result not wholly encouraging to such students as hoped to see better fruit from the new English school. In other respects, however, the result is more satisfactory. The author has taken some trouble with his